

[redacted]  
Parsippany, N.J. 07054  
20 November 1969

Government Executive Magazine

ATTN: [redacted]  
Shoreham Building  
806 15th St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear [redacted]

I think I enjoyed your letter more than you enjoyed mine! (But who ruffled whose feathers?) In any case, I thank you for your response, and your responsiveness.

I would set you straight on one point immediately; the farthest thing from my mind when I wrote you was to find out who your sources were-- I really don't want, or care, to know that. I was mostly interested to know, as I wrote, how many CIA analysts--actually how large a sample, statistically--you spoke for. (Your answer of "more than a dozen" seems somewhat less than "representative", even of a total population of [redacted] you know. I seriously question that latter figure, too, by the way, as representing the total number of CIA people implicated by your accusations!)

I think that one of your basic errors is trying to incriminate the entire CIA when, in truth, it sounds as if your (and your dozen sources') complaints center only around the handling of current intelligence activities, --(perhaps the office or 'shop' you left?). In fact, you lash out in different places and accuse 1) the entire intelligence community, 2) the armed services' intelligence activities, 3) the Nixon Administration, and 4) unnamed generals, admirals, and GS-18's of varying degrees of ineptness, fraud, and deceit, and then lay all the blame on the CIA! In that, I think you are letting the 'residue' that you admit to show through too obviously. If your 'hang-up' is with the government in general, or with the intelligence community in general, or with the handling of the Vietnam war, or with the unprotected intelligence collection vessels, or merely with one small area in the CIA; specify! (If the last of these is, in fact, the case, I think you have done a disservice.)

In all honesty, Mr. McGarvey, I have real difficulty swallowing anything written or told me by someone who boasts of "indepth knowledge and virtually unassailable judgement and a proven record of performance." (A lot of us believe we have such attributes, you see, but to publish that belief as a matter-of-fact in a nationwide magazine--.)

And to reference me to your two books on Vietnam as proof of your qualifications to indict the CIA leaves me cold, too: it's not really relevant, you know. In any case, I would like to read your books, but I do not believe that, even after I had read them, I could even judge whether or not you were an expert on Vietnam, let alone the entire CIA! I could undoubtedly determine from reading them that you know considerable about the situation, and that you had some personal opinions about it, but not whether you were the expert (the context you use) on the situation. I maintain, you see, that writing a book (or two) (or a magazine article, for that matter) about a contemporary subject does not automatically

qualify one as an expert. If such were the case, we have many, many 'experts' on Vietnam, (and many, many 'experts' on the Kennedy assassination, as another instance), each with his own 'expert' analysis of the situation, and each with his own 'expert' conclusions, the latter varying all over the block! And, after all; the Vietnam situation is only one aspect of the CIA's worldwide activities, isn't it? How about addressing their batting average on other fronts?

I should tell you at this point that I work in Army intelligence at Picatinny Arsenal, N.J., so have some familiarity with CIA's products (mostly those of a scientific and technical nature), and have nothing but praise for them! You'd really have to write a much more convincing article than your recent one to convince me (and many more like me) that their system isn't working! well!

You accuse the CIA of "choosing the path of least resistance in every crunch", but I keep having this nagging suspicion that you have done that very thing yourself--to leave the Agency and then start sniping at it from a distance. Wouldn't it have been more challenging to stay there and keep pushing for the changes you seem to think were so obviously needed--that is, of course, unless the need was not obvious to anyone but yourself? I feel that you have left a very precise kind of business-intelligence--to work in a very imprecise, truth-be-damned-for-sales-and-advertisers-and-circulation-figures business--journalism. You certainly must know the unethical and biased lengths to which the 'media' will go in order to sell copy! I would hope you are not entering on a career of that yourself!

I have some real, deep-down reservations (as, apparently, does Spiro) about this unrestrained, unlimited freedom of the press thing, you see. In your case, for instance, you are given license to vent your own personal disgruntlement in a widely-spread article that purports to represent "CIA's experts" when, at most, it apparently represents only you and "more than a dozen" others. I can only caution you to use more specifics, fewer generalities, and no sour grapes in your future articles on the CIA; your bias showed through quite obviously on that first one! (and your latest ones, as well!)

Yours for accuracy,



STAT